A4740-1

PROFILE OF THE EMPLOYMENT EXECUTIVE

A STUDY BY THE EMPLOYMENT MANAGEMENT ASSOCIATION AND DEUTSCH SHEA & EVANS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		PAGE
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	SOME BACKGROUND ON EMPLOYMENT EXECUTIVES	4
	The Elusive Job Title	4
	To Whom Do They Report?	4
	Longevity in the Field	6
	Other Jobs Held in Employment Field	7
	Jobs Held in Other Functions	8
	Method of Obtaining Position	10
	The Respondents	12
	Sex and Age	12
	Education	13
	Academic Degrees	15
	Employee Responsibility	18
	Base Salary	18
	Geographic Location	23
	Type of Organization	23
III.	THE WORKING ROLE	25
	Human Resources Planning and Initiation of Employment Policies	25
	Human Resources Requirements — How Far Ahead?	27
	Use of Computers in Work	27
IV.	ATTITUDES TOWARD PRESENT JOBS	31
	Job Satisfaction	31
	Compensation	31
	Rate of Promotion	31
	Access to Top Management	34
	Recognition Within Company	34
	Most Satisfying Aspect of Work	34
	Least Satisfying Aspect of Work	39
	Plans to Remain in Employment Field	43
	Career Replay	45
V.	OPINIONS ON DEVELOPMENTS IN EMPLOYMENT FIELD	48
	Feelings About Term "Human Resources"	48
	Will Human Resources Provide Upward Job Mobility?	48
	Portending Major Developments in the Field	51
VI.	PRODUCTIVITY	58
	Why the Decline?	58
	Social Change vs. Productivity	59
	Unions as a Cause	60
	Is Management Itself the Problem?	60
	Government as a Contributing Factor	61
	Education and the Home	62
	How to Reverse It	64
VII.	SOME CONCLUSIONS	70
	General	70
	By Sex	71
	By Age	72
APPENDIX		73
	Questionnaire	
	About Deutsch, Shea & Evans	

LIST OF TABLES

		PAGE
TABLE I:	EMPLOYMENT EXECUTIVES' TITLES	3
TABLE II:	TITLE/FUNCTION REPORTING TO: BY EMPLOYMENT RESPONSIBILITY	5
TABLE III:	YEARS IN THE EMPLOYMENT FIELD	7
TABLE IV:	NUMBER OF OTHER EMPLOYERS IN THE EMPLOYMENT FIELD	8
TABLE V:	EXPERIENCE IN OTHER FUNCTIONS: BY EMPLOYMENT RESPONSIBILITY AND YEARS IN EMPLOYMENT FIELD	9
TABLE VI:	METHODS OF OBTAINING PRESENT POSITION: BY SEX AND AGE	11
TABLE VII:	SEX AND AGE OF RESPONDENTS	12
TABLE VIII:	EDUCATION (HIGHEST GRADE COMPLETED): BY SEX, AGE AND EMPLOYMENT RESPONSIBILITY	14
TABLE IX:	DEGREES OBTAINED: BY SEX AND AGE	16
TABLE X:	DEGREES OBTAINED: BY LEVEL AND MAJOR FIELD OF STUDY	17
TABLE XI:	SCOPE OF EMPLOYMENT RESPONSIBILITY	19
TABLE XII:	BASE SALARY: BY SEX, AGE, LOCATION, YEARS IN EMPLOYMENT FIELD AND EMPLOYMENT RESPONSIBILITY	20
TABLE XIII:	DOES PRESENT COMPENSATION ACCURATELY REFLECT VALUE TO COMPANY?: BY SEX, AGE, LOCATION AND EMPLOYMENT RESPONSIBILITY	22
TABLE XIV:	RESPONDENTS' LOCATIONS	23
TABLE XV:	INVOLVEMENT IN HUMAN RESOURCES PLANNING: BY SEX, AGE, YEARS IN EMPLOYMENT FIELD AND EMPLOYMENT RESPONSIBILITY	26
TABLE XVI:	INITIATE EMPLOYMENT POLICIES: BY SEX, AGE, YEARS IN EMPLOYMENT FIELD AND EMPLOYMENT RESPONSIBILITY	26
TABLE XVII:	TIME FRAME FOR PROJECTING HUMAN RESOURCES REQUIREMENTS	27
TABLE XVIII:	USE OF COMPUTERS: BY SEX, AGE, LOCATION AND EMPLOYMENT RESPONSIBILITY	28

LIST OF TABLES Cont.

		PAGE
TABLE XIX:	COMPUTER USE — PURPOSES	29
TABLE XX:	SATISFACTION WITH WORK RELATED FACTORS: BY SEX, AGE AND LOCATION	33
TABLE XXI:	MOST SATISFYING ASPECT OF YOUR WORK: BY SEX	38
TABLE XXII:	LEAST SATISFYING ASPECT OF YOUR WORK: BY SEX	42
TABLE XXIII:	INTENT TO REMAIN IN EMPLOYMENT FIELD: BY SEX, AGE, YEARS IN THE FIELD AND EMPLOYMENT RESPONSIBILITY	44
TABLE XXIV:	CHOOSE EMPLOYMENT FIELD AGAIN?: BY SEX, AGE AND LOCATION	46
TABLE XXV:	FEELINGS ABOUT "HUMAN RESOURCES" TITLE	49
TABLE XXVI:	FUTURE CHANCE OF EMPLOYMENT PEOPLE FOR TOP MANAGEMENT	50
TABLE XXVII:	MAJOR DEVELOPMENT IN THE EMPLOYMENT FIELD IN THE 1980s	57
TABLE XXVIII:	MAJOR CAUSE OF PRESENT DECLINE IN PRODUCTIVITY	63
TABLE XXIX:	METHODS FOR REVERSING PRODUCTIVITY DECLINE	69

Copyright, 1979, Deutsch, Shea & Evans, Inc., 49 East 53rd St., New York, N.Y. 10022, (212) 688-0500. All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form by electronic, mechanical, photo-copying or other means without written permission. Printed in the United States of America.

I. INTRODUCTION

Considered for years to be little more than clerks, statisticians, or "the folks who make up the paychecks," the people who handle the human resources responsibilities of their organizations are finally coming into their own.

They do the wooing, weeding, counselling, motivating, and occasional discharging of the individuals who make the daily work wheel revolve to generate the profits at the bottom line.

Further, they see beyond the day's or week's end to months and sometimes years out to determine what their organizations will need by way of human resources, what will be available, and how to keep the supply and demand in balance.

In short, they have become critical to the success of their firms. They know it, and it appears that their managements are at least beginning to be cognizant of it, as well. Many employment executives are still riled by certain "Mickey Mouse" inevitabilities of their jobs: the phone call from the Chairman of the Board asking them to "try and find a job for my neighbor's son." But this aspect is diminishing as the general perception of employment executives as highly educated, well-paid, upwardly mobile, and essential becomes more and more prevalent.

Asked whether they like their work, the executives responded overwhelmingly that they do. They are largely pleased with their compensation (although they do not believe it equates to their true worth) and they are appreciative of the increasing recognition of their contributions. They report that the stumbling blocks formerly in the way of communicating with top management are gradually disappearing.

In nearly every category, however, the male respondents reported more satisfaction than the females, who still appear generally to be in positions of less responsibility and, when employed in capacities equal to those of male colleagues, are paid less. Interestingly, however, more females indicate that they would select work in the field again had they the choice, even though they do not seem as happy with some important aspects of their current positions as do the men.

Another pattern that emerged from the data is that female employment executives primarily enjoy the personal contact that is inherent in their workday -- the counselling, interviewing, and "people-oriented" tasks -- while the men found greater satisfaction with human resources planning and development.

Employment executives of both sexes deplored the steady diminution in worker productivity, a subject that we considered of such importance that a significant portion of this study is devoted to the subject.

Throughout the survey, the few respondents who did not specify their sex, age group, geographic location, years in employment field, or range of employment responsibility are excluded from analyses by these factors.

TABLE I

Title	% of Respondents
Personnel Mgr./Dir.	26
Employment Mgr./Dir.	20
Mgr./Dir./Supr. Indus'l Relations/Employee Relations	14
Recruitment Mgr./Dir.	6
Human Resources Mgr./Dir.	4
Mgr./Dir./Asst. Dir. of Manpower/ Human Resource Planning	1
Mgr./Dir. of Staffing & Personnel Administration	4
Personnel Administrator/Supr.	3
Employment Administrator/ Coordinator/Representative	3
Mgr./Dir. of Employment & Placement/Employment Sources/ Employment & EEO	2
VP/Asst. VP-Personnel	2
Personnel Consultant/Asst./ Specialist	2
Mgr./Asst. Mgr./Dir. of Placement/ Personnel Placement	2
Mgr./Dir. of Training & Development/ Personnel & Management Development/Recruitment & Management Development	2
Other	9
No answer	*

*Less than 1%.

II. SOME BACKGROUND ON EMPLOYMENT EXECUTIVES

The Elusive Job Title

The titles held by executives in the employment function represent quite a mixed bag. They cover the spectrum from the familiar (and rather time-worn) "Personnel Manager/Director" (26%), "Employment Manager/Director" (20%), and "Manager/Director of Staffing and Personnel Administration" (4%) to the relatively newly-coined "Human Resources Manager/Director" (4%).

The variety of titles contained in Table I reflects the diversity in managements' views towards their employment executives. Some seem a bit demeaning, while others connote appreciation, respect, and importance.

To Whom Do They Report?

As the following table indicates, about one-third (34%) of the respondents report to others in the personnel and employment function. Approximately equal numbers report to top management, general or administrative management, and industrial and labor relations management.

TABLE II

TITLE/FUNCTION REPORTING TO: BY EMPLOYMENT RESPONSIBILITY

	No. of Employees in Range of Responsibility						
	Total (905) 100%	Under 500 (211) 23%	500-999 (172) 19%	1,000-4,999 (325) 36%	5,000-9,999 (73) 8%	10,000-24,999 (56) 6%	25,000-or Over (57) 6%
No. of Respondents in Responsibility Range = 100%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Reporting to:							
Personnel/Employment	34	21	26	37	41	38	48
Mgr./Dir. Personnel	20	13	18	24	25	20	18
VP/Asst. VP Personnel	7	4	6	6	14	11	12
Mgr./Dir. VP Employment	4	2	2	3	1	5	9
Mgr./Dir. Recruitment	2	1	0	2	0	0	7
Asst. Mgr./Dir. Personnel	1	1	0	2	1	2	2
Top Management	19	25	19	17	16	25	4
President	9	15	9	7	8	9	0
Exec. VP/VP	7	7	6	8	4	14	4
Director/Controller	2	3	2	1	1	0	0
Chrm. of the Board/Bd. of Directors	1	*	2	1	3	2	0
Gen'l Operations/ Administrative Management	18	24	24	16	6	8	8
Gen'l/Plant/Operations Mgr.	9	16	13	6	4	0	4
Admin. VP	3	1	2	4	0	4	0
VP & Gen'l Mgr.	2	3	4	2	0	0	0
Mgr./Dir. Admin.	2	3	1	2	1	2	0
Misc. VPs/Asst. VPs	2	1	4	2	1	2	4
Indus'l./Labor/Employee Relations	17	11	18	21	21	14	11
Mgr./Dir. Indus'l/Labor/ Employee Relations	12	9	15	17	11	5	5
VP/Asst. VP Employee/ Personnel Relations	3	2	3	1	7	5	4
VP/Asst. VP Indus'l Relations	2	*	*	3	3	4	2
Human Resources/Manpower	7	6	6	7	10	9	11
Mgr./Dir. Human Resources/ Manpower	5	4	4	6	7	4	4
VP/Asst. VP Human Resources/ Manpower	2	2	2	1	3	5	7
Development/Training	2	1	1	2	1	2	9
Mgr./Dir. Management Devel./ Resources	1	*	*	2	0	0	9
Mgr./Dir. Personnel Devel./ Training & Devel.	1	*	1	*	1	2	0
Other	7	10	5	4	7	9	11
No answer	3	3	2	2	3	4	7
	**	**	**	**	**	**	**

*Less than 1%.
**Total exceeds 100%, due to multiple response.

At least 40% of employment executives report to individuals who are at the vice presidential level or above it.

Respondents who had responsibility for 1,000 or more employees were more likely to report to other personnel (or human resources) professionals than those who had responsibility for fewer individuals. The latter more often reported to general or administrative management or to their organization's president.

Longevity in the Field

Most of the overall sample (and most of the male respondents) had been in the employment field for ten or fewer years. Half of the female respondents reported less than six years' experience in this area.

Women have always been present in the employment field, but this and prior Deutsch, Shea & Evans studies reflected the steady growth in their numbers. For instance, the surveys indicated that women represented 13% of our total respondents in 1974 and 16% in 1977. This latest survey reflected 18% female participation.

Such an increase in their numbers and the relatively fewer years of experience among them would seem to indicate that employment is an expanding field for women.

TABLE III

Years in Employment Field	Total (905) 100%	Male (728) 80%	Female (158) 18%
	%	%	%
Under 6	29	24	50
6-10	27	27	30
11-15	21	24	10
16-20	12	13	8
21-25	6	7	0
Over 25	5	5	2
No answer	*	*	*

*Less than 1%.

Other Jobs Held in Employment Field

About one-third (34%) of the survey respondents stated that this was their first position in this field. Additionally, 45% have had just one or two other employers in the personnel area.

Among the women, 41% reported that this was their first personnel job, which bears out the growth in the number of female entrants to the field.

TABLE IV

No. of Other Employers in the Employment Field	Total (905) 100%	Male (728) 80%	Female (158) 18%
	%	%	%
none	34	33	41
one	26	26	24
two	19	18	25
three	12	12	6
four	4	5	2
five	4	4	1
six or more	1	2	1

Jobs Held in Other Functions

As Table V indicates, 23% have worked exclusively in the employment field, but over 76% gained experience in other areas. (Fewer than 1% did not respond to this question.)

Individuals who have been in the employment field less than six years were more likely to have come from other functions than those with more experience in personnel. Similarly, respondents who reported having responsibility for at least 10,000 employees are more likely to have had prior experience in other functions.

Where do these employment executives come from? Most often they have been in management and administration (48%). Twenty-two percent cite sales and marketing, 14% have been in production, and 10% have come from accounting and finance positions. Respondents who indicate "personnel" as a prior function are believed to be among those who reported having industrial relations titles, and vice versa.

TABLE V

EXPERIENCE IN OTHER FUNCTIONS: BY EMPLOYMENT RESPONSIBILITY AND YEARS IN EMPLOYMENT FIELD

		No. of Employees in Range of Responsibility						Years in Employment Field					
	Total	Under 500	500-999	1,000-4,999	5,000-9,999	10,000-24,999	25,000 or Over	Under 6	6-10	11-15	16-20	21-25	Over 25
	(905)	(211)	(172)	(325)	(73)	(56)	(57)	(259)	(247)	(193)	(109)	(53)	(42)
	100%	23%	19%	36%	8%	6%	6%	29%	27%	21%	12%	6%	5%
No. of respondents in each class. = 100%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Worked in other functions?													
Yes	76	78	75	73	78	80	88	82	74	77	74	70	64
No	23	22	24	27	21	20	12	18	25	23	24	30	31
No answer	*	0	1	*	1	0	0	0	*	0	2	0	5
Other functions cited**													
Management/admin.	48	48	46	48	42	56	56	45	53	45	59	38	48
Sales/marketing	22	26	24	20	18	27	18	25	25	23	14	19	15
Production	14	11	13	15	21	11	14	11	11	18	15	27	15
Finance/accounting	10	12	9	9	9	7	8	9	9	13	5	19	7
Engineering/design	7	7	6	8	7	9	2	5	7	7	11	5	0
Research/development	5	7	5	4	4	7	6	7	4	4	5	5	7
Personnel	4	3	2	5	7	2	8	2	5	4	4	8	7
Indus'l/employee rel.	4	2	4	3	11	7	4	4	3	3	5	8	4
Purchasing	2	4	4	1	0	0	2	3	2	*	3	0	7
Government/military	1	*	*	3	0	0	0	2	1	1	0	0	0
Other	19	21	20	18	16	18	12	25	16	19	15	11	11
No answer	*	1	0	*	2	0	0	0	*	*	1	3	0
	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#

*Less than 1%.
**Basis: respondents indicating prior experience in other functions.
Total exceeds 100%, due to multiple response.

Respondents with the greatest amount of employment responsibility report prior management or administrative experience more frequently, and respondents with 15 or fewer years' experience are more apt to have experience in sales and marketing than the rest of the group.

Method of Obtaining Position

How did these employment executives find their way to their current jobs? Most of the respondents (42%) obtained their present positions by means of in-company transfers or promotions (see Table VI). Twenty-two percent indicate that they had used employment agencies or search firms. Referrals by colleagues provided 11% with access to their current jobs, and 10% cite having answered an advertisement. Eight percent applied directly to their company and 4% were referred by acquaintances who already worked there. Two percent got their jobs through other methods. Only 1% of the respondents were recruited from college.

The male respondents seem to have relied on employment agencies and search firms somewhat more than their female counterparts, who have more often worked their way up within the company.

The older respondents cite promotions and business referrals as having gotten them to their current jobs. The younger groups more often sought the services of employment agencies and executive recruiters in getting their present positions.

TABLE VI

METHODS OF OBTAINING PRESENT POSITION: BY SEX AND AGE

		Sex		Age Group			
	Total (905) 100%	Male (728) 80%	Female (158) 18%	Under 35 (290) 32%	35-44 (334) 37%	45-54 (211) 23%	55 or Over (62) 7%
No. of respondents in sex or age group = 100%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Method of Obtaining Present Position							
Promotion/transfer	42	41	46	39	42	41	53
Employment agency/ search firm	22	23	20	26	25	19	7
Business referral	11	11	10	8	10	15	11
Answered ad	10	10	10	10	11	9	3
Applied directly	8	8	8	8	7	8	18
Employee referral	4	4	3	4	3	5	0
Recruited from college	1	1	2	3	*	*	2
Other	2	2	1	2	2	3	5
No answer	*	*	0	0	*	0	1

*Less than 1%.

Employment executives in industrial organizations are somewhat more likely to have been promoted from within their companies than the respondents from business-type establishments. The latter found their jobs through agencies more often than those in industry.

The Respondents

Sex and Age

The vast majority of the respondents (80%) are male. Eighteen percent are female, and 2% did not respond to this question.

Over two-thirds report being under 45 years of age. However, most of the female respondents are under 35 and most of the males are 35 and older.

TABLE VII

Age Group	Total (905) 100%	Male (728) 80%	Female (158) 18%
No. of respondents in sex = 100%	%	%	%
under 25	1	*	3
25-34	31	26	57
35-44	37	40	26
45-54	23	26	13
55 or over	7	8	1
no answer	*	*	*

*Less than 1%.

So few respondents are under 25 years of age that this group is combined with the 25-34 year group in the cross tabulation.

Education

The employment executives surveyed are generally well-educated. As Table VIII shows, virtually all (99%) participants attended college and 51% had taken graduate-level courses.

These male employment executives are significantly better educated than the female respondents, 54% having gone to graduate school versus only 41% of the females.

Less startling are the differences in education by age group, although respondents under 45 years of age are somewhat better educated than the older groups.

What is more important is the correlation between advanced education and the extent of employment responsibility. According to the study, employment executives who attended graduate school are more likely to have greater responsibility than those who terminated their education at the bachelor's degree level.

TABLE VIII

EDUCATION (HIGHEST GRADE COMPLETED): BY SEX, AGE AND EMPLOYMENT RESPONSIBILITY

		Sex		Age Group				No. of Employees in Range of Responsibility					
	Total (905) 100%	Male (728) 80%	Female (158) 18%	Under 35 (290) 32%	35-44 (334) 37%	45-54 (211) 23%	55 or Over (62) 7%	Under 500 (211) 23%	500-999 (172) 19%	1,000-4,999 (325) 36%	5,000-9,999 (73) 8%	10,000-24,999 (56) 6%	25,000 or Over (57) 6%
No. of respondents in each class. = 100%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Highest grade completed													
High school graduate	1	1	1	*	*	2	3	*	3	1	0	0	0
College	48	45	58	49	45	47	50	62	58	41	28	39	28
one year	3	2	8	2	2	4	8	3	5	2	0	3	0
two years	5	3	12	3	3	9	5	8	5	4	3	0	2
three years	3	2	8	3	2	3	5	5	5	2	3	0	2
four years	37	38	30	41	38	31	32	46	43	33	22	36	24
Graduate school	51	54	41	51	55	50	47	37	39	58	71	61	72
one year	21	22	20	18	24	22	24	15	16	26	30	23	25
two years	23	24	17	28	22	22	10	17	18	25	29	29	35
three years	3	4	1	2	4	4	3	1	2	4	8	4	3
four years	4	4	3	3	5	2	10	4	3	3	4	5	9
No answer	*	*	0	0	*	*	0	0	0	*	1	0	0

*Less than 1%.

Academic Degrees

Of the total sample, 83% have bachelor's degrees. Thirty-three percent have master's degrees, and 2% have earned Ph.D's. A scant 1% lack any degree. (8% did not answer.)

Female employment executives and older executives of both sexes are not as extensively educated as the male and younger segments of the sample. The former categories also exhibit more reluctance to specify which degree they have earned.

The employment executives surveyed earned their degrees in a wide variety of fields, as Table X shows.

On the AA/AS level, the majority of associate degree recipients, 54%, have received these in business administration/management. Another 18% have majored in liberal arts, 9% in engineering and science. Only 2% have studied industrial or labor relations and none had majored in human resources or personnel.

Among the holders of bachelor's degrees in our survey, comparatively few (6%) respondents received them in personnel or, for that matter, industrial or labor relations (7%). Twenty-eight percent majored in business-related subjects, 17% in the social sciences, and 16% in political science/government/economics.

Much more interest in personnel as a major field of study is exhibited on the master's degree level, although business continues to be the preferred course. Thirty-eight percent of survey respondents have received MA/MS degrees in management, accounting/finance, or marketing. Thirty percent of these have obtained degrees in personnel or industrial/labor relations and 16% have opted for the social sciences.

TABLE IX

DEGREES OBTAINED: BY SEX AND AGE

		Sex		Age			
	Total (905) 100%	Male (728) 80%	Female (158) 18%	Under 35 (290) 32%	35-44 (334) 37%	45-54 (211) 23%	55 or Over (62) 7%
No. of respondents in sex or age group = 100%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Degree Obtained							
AA/AS	7	7	8	8	7	7	3
BA/BS	83	86	67	86	87	75	75
MA/MS	33	34	28	37	30	32	35
Ph.D	2	2	*	1	3	*	5
No degree	1	1	1	*	*	3	3
No answer	8	5	23	5	5	14	18
	**	**	**	**	**	**	**

*Less than 1%.
**Total exceeds 100%, due to multiple response.

TABLE X

DEGREES OBTAINED: BY LEVEL AND MAJOR FIELD OF STUDY

No. of respondents with degree = 100%	AA/AS (66) 100% %	BA/BS (747) 100% %	MA/MS (299) 100% %	Ph.D (19) 100% %
Major Field of Study				
Business/indus'l admin./management	46	22	33	16
Accounting/finance	5	3	3	0
Marketing	3	3	2	5
Political science/govt./history/ economics	3	16	5	16
Social sciences: psych./behavioral sciences/sociology/anthropology	1	17	16	32
Liberal arts: arts/humanities/ Eng. lit./journalism	18	9	2	5
Engineering/science	9	8	3	0
Indus'l labor relations/psych. organizational behavior	2	7	14	5
Human resources/personnel admin./ management	0	6	16	11
Education	3	4	3	5
Other	9	4	4	0
Don't know/no answer	1	1	*	5
			**	

*Less than 1%.
**Total exceeds 100%, due to multiple response.

The number of respondents having Ph.D's is so small that we will not comment on their fields of study.

Employee Responsibility

As Table XI shows, 42% of the respondents report having responsibility for fewer than 1,000 employees. Thirty-six percent are responsible for 1,000-4,999 employees and 20% for 5,000 or more. Approximately 2% did not reply to the query.

The female respondents are generally in positions with less responsibility than the males. Sixty percent were responsible for fewer than 1,000 employees, while only 39% of the males surveyed had responsibility in that range.

The study revealed that employment responsibility seems to peak in the 45-54 year age group.

Base Salary

Respondents as a whole report median base salary in the $25-$29,999 range, but the men's compensation is considerably higher than the women's — $30-$34,999 as a median salary versus $20-$24,999 (see Table XII).

Fifty-one percent of the men earn $30,000 or more per annum in contrast to only 12% of the women. Thus, it is not surprising that female employment

TABLE XI

SCOPE OF EMPLOYMENT RESPONSIBILITY

		Sex		Age Group			
	Total (905) 100%	Male (728) 80%	Female (158) 18%	Under 35 (290) 32%	35-44 (334) 37%	45-54 (211) 23%	55 or Over (62) 7%
No. of respondents in sex or age = 100%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
No. of Employees in Responsibility Range							
under 500	23	20	39	26	23	20	24
500-999	19	19	21	22	19	16	21
1,000-4,999	36	38	26	38	38	33	29
5,000-9,999	8	9	6	5	8	12	10
10,000-24,999	6	7	2	4	7	7	6
25,000 or over	6	7	4	4	5	11	10
No answer	2	*	2	1	*	1	0

*Less than 1%.

TABLE XII

BASE SALARY: BY SEX, AGE, LOCATION, YEARS IN EMPLOYMENT FIELD AND EMPLOYMENT RESPONSIBILITY

		Sex		Age Group				Geographic Location					
	Total (905) 100%	Male (728) 80%	Female (158) 18%	Under 35 (290) 32%	35-44 (334) 37%	45-54 (211) 23%	55 or Over (62) 7%	New Eng. (164) 18%	Mid-Atl. (273) 30%	South-east (63) 7%	Mid-west (216) 24%	South-west (56) 6%	West (127) 14%
No. of respondents in each class. = 100%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Present base salary													
Under $15,000	3	1	10	6	*	*	2	2	3	6	3	2	2
$15-19,999	11	6	33	21	7	6	7	15	8	16	13	4	11
$20-24,999	20	18	32	34	15	13	11	26	19	16	23	31	14
$25-29,999	22	24	13	22	25	19	19	18	19	24	21	32	28
$30-34,999	17	20	6	10	19	24	19	16	17	27	16	21	17
$35-44,999	18	21	4	5	22	26	24	13	25	8	17	7	18
$45,000 or over	8	10	2	1	11	12	18	10	9	3	7	11	10
No answer	*	*	0	*	*	0	0	*	0	0	*	2	0

*Less than 1%

	Years in Employment Field						No. of Employees in Range of Responsibility					
	Under 6 (259) 29%	6-10 (247) 27%	11-15 (193) 21%	16-20 (109) 12%	21-25 (53) 6%	Over 25 (42) 5%	Under 500 (211) 23%	500-999 (172) 19%	1,000-4,999 (325) 36%	5,000-9,999 (73) 8%	10,000-24,999 (56) 6%	25,000-or Over (57) 6%
No. of respondents in each class. = 100%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Present base salary												
Under $15,000	8	*	0	*	0	0	9	2	*	0	0	0
$15-19,999	22	12	3	4	2	7	19	17	9	0	0	2
$20-24,999	33	23	13	10	9	10	26	26	22	14	5	0
$25-29,999	19	28	24	14	21	14	28	19	23	19	18	7
$30-34,999	9	18	22	23	27	19	10	21	21	25	16	9
$35-44,999	7	14	25	27	30	31	7	11	19	23	38	42
$45,000 or over	2	4	13	21	11	19	1	4	5	19	23	40
No answer	*	1	0	*	0	0	0	*	*	0	0	0

*Less than 1%.

executives are unhappy about their compensation, as reported in Table XIII, and consider themselves worth more to their companies than one could infer from their salaries.

It appears that salary level increases in direct proportion to the age of the employment executive. The median for the youngest (under 35) group is $20-$24,999. The median for all other groups is $30-$34,999, but the differences are evident in the upper salary brackets. In the 35-44 age group only 33% report incomes of at least $35,000; in the 45-54 group, 39% do so, as do 42% in the 55 and over group. As might be expected, respondents under the age of 35, aware of their salary differentials, express more dissatisfaction about their compensation than the other age groups (see Table XIII).

The median salary for the various geographic areas surveyed is $24-$29,999, except for the $30-$34,999 reported by the Mid-Atlantic region. Overall, the lowest salaries are reported in the Southeast. The same area, however, also reports the greatest satisfaction with compensation, which may relate to the lower cost of living in that area.

The survey reveals that compensation for employment executives increases steadily for the first ten years of experience in the field, after which median salary tends to level off.

Not surprisingly, as employment responsibility increases, so does the salary level. Eighty-two percent of the respondents with responsibility for fewer than 500 employees are paid less than $30,000 a year in contrast to the 82% having responsibility for 25,000 or more employees, who earn at least $35,000. This is

TABLE XIII

DOES PRESENT COMPENSATION ACCURATELY REFLECT VALUE TO COMPANY?: BY SEX, AGE, LOCATION AND EMPLOYMENT RESPONSIBILITY

		Sex		Age Group				Geographic Location						No. of Employees in Range of Responsibility					
	Total	Male	Female	Under 35	35-44	45-54	55 or Over	New Eng.	Mid-Atl.	South-east	Mid-west	South-west	West	Under 500	500-999	1,000-4,999	5,000-9,999	10,000-24,999	25,000 or Over
	(905)	(728)	(158)	(290)	(334)	(211)	(62)	(164)	(273)	(63)	(216)	(56)	(127)	(211)	(172)	(325)	(73)	(56)	(57)
	100%	80%	18%	32%	37%	23%	7%	18%	30%	7%	24%	6%	14%	23%	19%	36%	8%	6%	6%
No. of respondents in each class. = 100%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Does present compensation reflect value to company?																			
Yes	45	48	31	39	47	50	49	45	42	48	47	43	48	35	43	46	52	55	65
No	45	42	56	47	44	42	40	44	46	41	46	39	43	53	47	42	40	34	32
Don't know/no answer	10	10	13	14	9	8	11	11	12	11	7	18	9	12	10	12	8	11	3

perhaps a tie-in to the feeling of being properly compensated that is reported by the respondents having greater employment responsibility (see Table XIII).

Geographic Location

The survey's respondents reported their locations as follows:

TABLE XIV

	% of Respondents
New England	18
Mid-Atlantic	30
Southeast	7
Midwest	24
Southwest	6
Mountain	*
West	14
No answer	*

*Less than 1%.

The number of respondents in the Mountain states is so meager that it is combined with those in the West in the cross tabulation.

Type of Organization

The majority of employment executives (63%) work in industrial or manufacturing organizations. Another 15% work in business and financial companies. The remaining 22% are employed by service organizations (5%), engineering/construction firms (3%), research/development/exploration companies

(3%), and institutional organizations, the government, and utilities (2% each). Fewer than 1% of the respondents report working in architectural/design firms. Five percent work in other (non-specified) types of organizations. Because industrial organizations were so heavily present in the sample, analysis by type of organization was not included.

III. THE WORKING ROLE

Human Resources Planning and Initiation of Employment Policies

As Table XV indicates, 72% of the survey's respondents are involved in planning for their organization's human resources. Most likely to be involved are male employment executives in the 35-54 age group with over ten years' experience. Furthermore, those with responsibility for 10,000 or more employees are involved somewhat more often than those with responsibility for fewer staff members.

The data indicate that female respondents are not as involved in planning as the males. Only 58% of the women replied that they were "planners" versus 76% of the men.

As far as initiating employment policies, 62% of the group do so. As with planning for human resources, the same survey segment yields the policy makers: men in the 35-54 age group with over ten years' experience in the field and currently bearing substantial employment responsibility (see Table XVI).

While here, again, female employment executives are not so likely to be policy makers as the men, it should be noted that over half the women in the group are policy makers and planners.

TABLE XV

INVOLVEMENT IN HUMAN RESOURCES PLANNING: BY SEX, AGE, YEARS IN EMPLOYMENT FIELD AND EMPLOYMENT RESPONSIBILITY

		Sex		Age Group				Years in Employment Field						No. of Employees in Range of Responsibility					
*Less than 1%	Total	Male	Female	Under 35	35-44	45-54	55 or Over	Under 6	6-10	11-15	16-20	21-25	Over 25	Under 500	500-999	1,000-4,999	5,000-9,999	10,000-24,999	25,000- or Over
	(905)	(728)	(158)	(290)	(334)	(211)	(62)	(259)	(247)	(193)	(109)	(53)	(42)	(211)	(172)	(325)	(73)	(56)	(57)
	100%	80%	18%	32%	37%	23%	7%	29%	27%	21%	12%	6%	5%	23%	19%	36%	8%	6%	6%
No. of respondents in each class. = 100%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Involved in Human Resources Planning?																			
Yes	72	76	58	64	79	74	69	62	70	80	81	83	79	71	73	73	70	77	75
No	27	23	42	35	21	25	29	36	30	19	18	17	19	28	26	27	30	20	23
Don't know/no answer	*	1	0	1	*	*	2	2	0	1	*	0	2	*	*	*	0	3	2

TABLE XVI

INITIATE EMPLOYMENT POLICIES: BY SEX, AGE, YEARS IN EMPLOYMENT FIELD AND EMPLOYMENT RESPONSIBILITY

		Sex		Age Group				Years in Employment Field						No. of Employees in Range of Responsibility					
	Total	Male	Female	Under 35	35-44	45-54	55 or Over	Under 6	6-10	11-15	16-20	21-25	Over 25	Under 500	500-999	1,000-4,999	5,000-9,999	10,000-24,999	25,000- or Over
	(905)	(728)	(158)	(290)	(334)	(211)	(62)	(259)	(247)	(193)	(109)	(53)	(42)	(211)	(172)	(325)	(73)	(56)	(57)
	100%	80%	18%	32%	37%	23%	7%	29%	27%	21%	12%	6%	5%	23%	19%	36%	8%	6%	6%
No. of respondents in each class. = 100%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Initiate Employment Policies?																			
Yes	62	64	53	56	68	62	60	52	59	71	66	77	67	51	61	65	64	77	77
No	35	33	44	41	30	33	36	44	39	26	27	21	29	46	36	31	32	21	21
Sometimes	1	1	3	1	1	2	3	1	2	2	3	2	2	2	1	2	1	0	0
Don't know/no answer	2	2	*	2	1	3	1	3	*	1	4	0	2	1	2	2	3	2	2

*Less than 1%

Human Resources Requirements—How Far Ahead?

Long range planning for their human resources requirements is unusual among the respondents' organizations. In fact, nearly half (49%) of the employment executives report that such needs are projected only a year ahead or less.

TABLE XVII

Time Frame for Projecting Human Resources Requirements	% of Respondents
1 year or less	49
2-3 years	22
4-5 years	22
6-10 years	2
Over 10 years	*
Don't know/no answer	5

*Less than 1%.

Use of Computers in Work

Seventy-six percent of the respondents make use of computers in their work. Use is more prevalent among the male employment executives (79%) than the females (63%) and among those 35 years and older than among their younger colleagues (see Table XVIII).

The use of computers has not become as common in the Northeast and Midwest, according to this study, as elsewhere in the U.S., especially the Southwest.

As might be expected, executives having responsibility for 1,000 or more employees are more likely to make use of computers than those with a lesser degree of responsibility.

TABLE XVIII

USE OF COMPUTERS: BY SEX, AGE, LOCATION AND EMPLOYMENT RESPONSIBILITY

		Sex		Age Group				Geographic Location						No. of Employees in Range of Responsibility					
	Total (905) 100%	Male (728) 80%	Female (158) 18%	Under 35 (290) 32%	35-44 (334) 37%	45-54 (211) 23%	55 or Over (62) 7%	New Eng. (164) 18%	Mid-Atl. (273) 30%	South-east (63) 7%	Mid-west (216) 24%	South-west (56) 6%	West (127) 14%	Under 500 (211) 23%	500-999 (172) 19%	1,000-4,999 (325) 36%	5,000-9,999 (73) 8%	10,000-24,999 (56) 6%	25,000 or Over (57) 6%
No. of respondents in each class. = 100%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Use Computers																			
Yes	76	79	63	70	82	76	76	74	76	79	76	84	77	65	77	80	86	80	83
No	24	21	37	30	18	24	24	26	24	21	24	16	23	35	23	20	14	20	17
Extent of Use**																			
Very extensive use	11	12	7	9	10	13	19	6	14	10	6	17	18	5	7	11	27	24	9
Considerable use	39	39	35	32	42	43	36	34	36	32	44	40	44	31	36	42	33	40	57
Limited use	48	47	56	57	46	44	41	57	49	56	47	43	36	61	55	45	40	36	30
No answer	2	2	2	2	2	*	4	3	1	2	3	0	2	3	2	2	0	0	4
Computer Use to Increase?**																			
Yes	90	91	84	88	93	90	83	93	89	86	90	89	91	83	87	92	98	93	96
No	4	4	3	4	2	4	6	2	5	4	4	2	3	7	5	3	2	2	0
No answer	6	5	13	8	5	6	11	5	6	10	6	9	6	10	8	5	0	5	4

*Less than 1%.
**Basis: respondents indicating they use computers.

The 76% making use of computers are approximately equally divided between those reporting considerable or very extensive use (50%) of this user group and those indicating limited use (48%). Not surprisingly, the extent of computer use rises in direct proportion to the increased scope of employment responsibility.

The comparatively fewer women who make use of computers tend to do so to an extent that is limited vis-a-vis the male group. The older respondents apparently make use of computers more extensively than the younger, and respondents in the West and Southwest cited greater usage than those in the Eastern part of the U.S.

For what purposes are the computers used? As Table XIX reveals, user respondents mentioned affirmative action data most often (75%). Sixty-nine percent found them helpful for compensation, 40% for skills registers, and another 40% for personnel research.

TABLE XIX

Computer Use	% of Respondents
Affirmative action data	75
Compensation	69
Skills register	40
Personnel research	40
Personnel records/data	6
Recruiting/job posting/resume handling	6
Benefits administration	5
Reports/data	4
Employment reports/profiles	4
Personnel turnover/termination reports	2
Budget reports	*
Other	7
	**

*Less than 1%.
**Total exceeds 100%, due to multiple response.

Ninety percent of the employment executives currently making use of computers in their work expect usage to increase, particularly the respondents with substantial employment responsibility.

IV. ATTITUDES TOWARD PRESENT JOBS

Job Satisfaction

The survey queried the employment executives about the extent of their satisfaction with four aspects of their current position:

- o Compensation
- o Rate of promotion
- o Access to top management
- o Recognition within company

Overall, the executives seem satisfied with their work. However, there is a palpable difference between the feelings of the female respondents and those of the males. It is readily discernible that the women are less content. Let us consider the responses by category:

Compensation

On the whole, respondents are reasonably well satisfied with their current compensation (84%), although the male employment executives are more pleased (86%) than the females (76%) (see Table XX). Also, job satisfaction is more prevalent among those in the 35+ age group and along the East Coast.

Although employment executives are generally satisfied with their compensation, they do not necessarily think it equates to the worth of their work. In answer to the question "Do you think your present compensation accurately reflects your value to the company?" only 45% replied yes. Another 45% said no, while the remaining 10% either were uncertain or did not answer (see Table XIII).

The female executives are especially convinced that they are of more value to their companies than their compensation would indicate. Similar feelings were expressed by all respondents under age 35 and those in the Mid-Atlantic and Southwest regions of the U.S.

The survey also indicates that as the executives' employment responsibility increases, so does their feeling that their compensation is aligned with their value to the organization; the greater their responsibility, the more equitable they find their pay.

Rate of Promotion

While approximately three-quarters of the respondents (77%) report being highly or moderately satisfied with their rate of promotion within the organization, men (78%) more than women (74%) tend to have this view. However, a definite decline in satisfaction is evident as age increases. Table XX also shows that respondents from the Northeast and Midwest are less pleased with their advancement than employment executives in other regions of the country.

TABLE XX A

SATISFACTION WITH WORK RELATED FACTORS: BY SEX, AGE AND LOCATION

		Sex		Age Group				Geographic Location					
	Total (905) 100%	Male (728) 80%	Female (158) 18%	Under 35 (290) 32%	35-44 (334) 37%	45-54 (211) 23%	55 or Over (62) 7%	New Eng. (164) 18%	Mid-Atl. (273) 30%	South-east (63) 7%	Mid-west (216) 24%	South-west (56) 6%	West (127) 14%
No. of respondents in each class. = 100%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Satisfaction with Compensation													
Highly satisfied	29	31	19	22	30	35	31	28	28	25	26	36	35
Moderately satisfied	55	55	57	56	56	51	56	57	57	62	56	45	48
Somewhat dissatisfied	13	12	18	17	13	11	11	12	12	10	15	14	16
Very dissatisfied	2	2	5	4	1	2	2	2	3	3	2	5	1
No answer	*	*	*	*	*	*	0	*	*	0	*	0	8
Satisfaction with rate of Promotion													
Highly satisfied	32	31	38	38	31	28	21	37	27	30	29	36	40
Moderately satisfied	45	47	36	41	46	46	53	38	47	51	46	43	45
Somewhat dissatisfied	15	15	17	15	16	18	11	13	17	16	17	16	11
Very dissatisfied	5	4	7	5	4	5	7	6	6	2	5	5	2
No answer	3	3	2	1	3	3	8	6	3	1	3	0	2

*Less than 1%

TABLE XX B

SATISFACTION WITH WORK RELATED FACTORS: BY SEX, AGE AND LOCATION

		Sex		Age Group				Geographic Location					
	Total (905) 100%	Male (728) 80%	Female (158) 18%	Under 35 (290) 32%	35-44 (334) 37%	45-54 (211) 23%	55 or Over (62) 7%	New Eng. (164) 18%	Mid-Atl. (273) 30%	South-east (63) 7%	Mid-west (216) 24%	South-west (56) 6%	West (127) 14%
No. of respondents in each class. = 100%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Satisfaction with access to top Management													
Highly satisfied	55	58	43	51	58	57	63	58	56	54	53	54	57
Moderately satisfied	31	29	40	33	31	27	26	31	29	37	29	34	30
Somewhat dissatisfied	10	10	12	10	9	12	8	8	11	8	12	7	12
Very dissatisfied	3	3	5	6	1	3	2	2	4	0	5	5	1
No answer	1	*	0	*	*	1	1	*	0	1	1	0	*
Satisfaction with Recognition within Company													
Highly satisfied	42	43	36	38	43	47	44	45	41	44	41	45	43
Moderately satisfied	41	40	44	44	41	36	37	38	42	48	39	32	41
Somewhat dissatisfied	13	12	15	13	13	11	11	13	14	5	15	9	10
Very dissatisfied	4	4	4	4	3	5	2	3	3	2	4	9	3
No answer	*	1	*	*	*	1	6	*	*	1	1	0	3

*Less than 1%.

Access to Top Management

There are no roadblocks to top management for 86% of the responding executives. Once again, male executives (87%) felt somewhat more satisfied with their access to the higher echelons than the females (83%). Less satisfaction with this factor was recorded in the Midwest than in other parts of the U.S. No particular age pattern was discernible from the data provided in Table XX.

Recognition Within Company

Do employment executives feel their merits are recognized? Eighty-three percent of the respondents appear to be satisfied with this aspect of their present position. The pattern of the males being more content with their recognition (83%) than the females (80%) again prevails. There is no deviation in satisfaction evident among the age groups. Respondents from the Southeast seem most satisfied with this aspect of their careers, and those from the Midwest the least.

Most Satisfying Aspect of Work

What aspects of their jobs appeal most to employment executives and what do they like the least?

The respondents reveal no predominant single source of satisfaction. However, as Table XXI portrays, most did cite a particular job function as being most satisfying.

The most often mentioned (23%) group of job functions was interviewing, recruiting, and placement. "Placing a talented individual in a challenging job" is satisfying for one executive, while another reports his sense of pride in "satisfying people's employment objectives in correlation with the needs of the company". "Recruiting to fill a difficult manpower requirement and finding an employee who ultimately attains or exceeds management's expectations" gives another executive job satisfaction.

Some executives find satisfaction in the affirmative action aspects of their work: "Helping employees get through doors formerly closed to them because of race/sex, etc. . . seeing entrenched attitudes change," cites one. Another mentions a feeling of accomplishment upon placing a handicapped person.

The challenge of locating the perfect individual for a difficult-to-fill spot lends ongoing excitement to the work-weeks of many respondents, who offer as examples "recruiting people externally at the six-figure level without using a search firm," "getting the right candidate for the right job," "placing candidates in non-traditional positions," "the challenge of locating engineers in today's market," "finding a star".

Planning and development are favorite aspects of the workdays of 15% of the respondents: "Working with other departmental functions to develop and implement new recruiting concepts" is cited by one executive as the most appealing factor in the job. Another enjoys "initiating and influencing the human resources organization to make a more effective management team". "The challenge of maximizing the human resources contribution" and "conceiving, developing, 'selling', and implementing programs" were also offered as reasons for satisfaction.

Eleven percent of the sample find employee relations activities most satisfying. Some expand on this a bit, offering comments on their pleasure in participating in and overseeing the day-to-day employee relations in the plant. One executive, for example, says he especially enjoys serving as a catalyst to senior management to focus their attention on the various aspects of their conduct in dealing with employees.

Management and administration are particularly enjoyed by 8% of the employment executives, who offer "administration of corporate personnel policy," "supervision of the national recruiting function," "supervising subordinates," "policy administration," and "motivating others, directing," as aspects of their jobs that most please them (see Table XXI).

Some report a particular job characteristic as being the most satisfactory aspect of their work. For instance, 7% like their access to management. "Direct involvement in total business decisions" is offered by one employment executive as the favorite aspect of the job. Another reports pleasure in "seeing a direct positive impact on the corporation as a result of my personal effort. . .to have influence in those decisions that affect the employees of our company".

Others (6%) comment on working with people — the personal contact inherent in the employment executive's job. One speaks of the relationship of trust he has developed with his employees. Another just enjoys "talking with people".

Then, there are the problem solvers, the 6% who report their satisfaction in their "ability to resolve personnel problems to the employees' and company's satisfaction".

Several respondents find compensation and benefit administration work as they relate to the employment process to be most satisfying. Others express a keen awareness of the progress of "their hires" and their enjoyment in seeing them promoted.

Three percent appreciate the autonomy of their jobs. "Freedom to operate within my area," responds one executive to the question about the most satisfying aspect of work. "Ability to make decisions. . .my accountability," states another. One is pleased to be allowed to "implement programs with little resistance from the company president".

Three percent like the variety and challenge provided by employment work. "There are new challenges daily," is one comment. Another executive describes the diversity of a rapidly changing field. "The scope and variety of my involvement," replies another.

The responsibility inherent in the position of employment executive is especially pleasing to 2%. "Being responsible for a totally independent employment/placement operation," as one respondent phrases it.

Another 2% are results-oriented. Some typical comments: "A job well done," "achieving required goals," "ability to accomplish objectives".

And, of course, employment executives like recognition: "I am the recognized personnel pro in the company," asserts one respondent proudly. Another is delighted when management recognizes employment's importance in corporate profitability. Still another enjoys receiving recognition in this field.

TABLE XXI

MOST SATISFYING ASPECT OF YOUR WORK: BY SEX

	Total (905) 100%	Male (728) 80%	Female (158) 18%
No. of respondents in sex = 100%	%	%	%
MOST SATISFYING ASPECT OF WORK			
Job Functions:			
Interviewing/recruiting/ placement	23	23	26
Human resources planning/ development	15	17	10
Employee relations	11	11	10
Management/administration	8	8	8
Counselling	5	4	8
Long range/policy planning	3	3	3
Employment	2	2	3
Compensation	2	2	4
Promotions	*	*	0
Job Characteristics:			
Access to management	7	6	8
Working with people	6	6	8
Solving personnel problems	6	6	6
Autonomy	3	3	3
Variety of work	3	4	*
Responsibility	2	2	0
Achieving objectives	2	3	*
Recognition	1	1	0
Everything	1	1	1
Nothing	*	*	0
Other	11	11	15
Don't know/no answer	8	8	10
	**	**	**

*Less than 1%.
**Total exceeds 100%, due to multiple response.

The survey's breakout by sex points up that female executives are more satisfied with the personal contact that is part and parcel of their day's work: interviewing, counselling, contact with management. In contrast, male executives seem somewhat more interested in human resources planning and development, and state their appreciation of the variety in their work and their enjoyment in achieving objectives.

A number of especially blithe respondents (1%) report liking all aspects of their work. "All aspects of human resources recruiting and administration," answers one to the query about most satisfying aspects of work. Says another, "The entire job is very satisfying". What does a third like? "The whole operation."

Least Satisfying Aspect of Work

Inevitably, work as an employment executive is not always a bowl of cherries. Quite a range of individual dissatisfactions is reported in response to the question, "What is the least satisfying aspect of your work?"

At the top of the list of employment executives' gripes (20%) is the endless stream of paperwork (see Table XXII). It is variously described by respondents as "mundane," "excessive," and "mountainous." Another refers to it as "very necessary and extremely important," but cannot refrain from citing it as the least appealing aspect of the job. Some resent having to produce "unnecessary" or "useless" reports. Another is frustrated by the redundant nature of paperwork and the constant demand for documentation. Another, commenting on a dislike of record-keeping, used the apt phrase "administrivia."

Complying with governmental regulations and dealing with governmental agencies strikes 15% of respondents as aspects of their jobs they can cheerfully do without. How do they phrase this? "Dealing with governmental morons," states one bluntly. "Jousting with governmental agencies," "dealing with bureaucrats — OSHA, EEO, ERISA, etc.," "dealing with federal agencies and other outside agencies that do not understand business problems," reply other respondents. One says succinctly, "The multiplicity of governmental restrictions/reports in the employment area hampers effective, creative employment activity, including internal company activities".

Interestingly, the employment functions of recruiting, interviewing, and counselling that so pleased certain respondents turn off another 10%, who cite them as the least favorite aspects of their jobs as employment executives. What was it that they dislike? "Being inundated with agency phone calls and the volumes of resumes," "non-productive 'political' interviewing," "counselling marginal employees," "telling a candidate he is not to be selected," are factors mentioned.

Six percent of respondents don't like to be involved with wage, benefit, budget, pension plan and general administration work as they relate to the employment process.

Another 6% are unhappy over internal company politics. Typical causes for dissatisfaction are "politicking," "bureaucratic red tape — having to go through sensitive channels, taking extensive time to get a simple task completed".

Two percent find certain aspects of employee relations difficult, citing "employee complaints, which can be extremely petty," and "coaching, counselling,

or disciplinary situations".

Four percent complain about "problems in stimulating interest of the management personnel in advanced thinking," "working with superiors whose lack of human resources skills constantly results in negative impact on their subordinates," "constantly explaining to management the meaning of affirmative action," "lack of cooperation from associated departments," and "dealing with 'non-people oriented' line managers".

Some (2%) employment executives are nettled by the lack of recognition of the employment field. . ."the fact that the personnel function is not highly regarded by others in the firm," "the lack of understanding or appreciation of the human resources function by managers," "the lack of image and clout," "being 'taken for granted' ".

Unlike their colleagues who thrive on designing or changing programs or policies, some (fewer than 1%) view these factors as distasteful. Others report being abashed or trepidatious about having to implement lay-offs. Some call certain types of referrals obnoxious: "absurd requests, such as 'help my neighbor's son find a job' ". Three percent of the surveyed employment executives feel crushed under their workload.

Others are frustrated by having to deal with what they perceive as poor-quality colleagues in other company areas, mentioning as particularly onerous "dealing with narrow-minded corporate/divisional personnel managers," "having to work around incompetent directors with poor management skills," "maintaining watch over certain managers who constantly try to abuse the system for their own short-term objectives".

TABLE XXII

LEAST SATISFYING ASPECT OF YOUR WORK: BY SEX

No. of respondents in sex = 100%	Total (905) 100%	Male (728) 80%	Female (158) 18%
	%	%	%
LEAST SATISFYING ASPECT OF WORK			
Job Characteristics:			
Paperwork/reports	20	19	24
Complying with govt. regulations	15	16	9
Workload	3	3	2
Repetition	3	3	1
Lack of recognition	2	2	4
Changing programs/procedures	*	1	0
Job Functions:			
Recruiting/interviewing/ counselling	10	10	13
Wage/salary/benefit & other administration	6	6	5
Employee relations	2	2	4
Layoffs/terminations	2	2	*
Compensation	1	1	3
Referrals	1	1	0
Training	*	*	1
Staff function	*	*	*
Employer:			
Internal politics/red tape/ admin. details	6	6	6
Supervisors/management relations	4	4	5
The corporation/organization	2	2	1
Inconsistent policies/lack of decisions	2	3	1
Nothing	3	3	1
Other	12	13	9
Don't know/no answer	13	12	17
	**	**	**

*Less than 1%.
**Total exceeds 100%, due to multiple response.

Other employment executives reveal, either subtly or overtly, a general dissatisfaction with their employer (2%). Their reasons are varied: "Company was recently acquired," "obsolete administrative policies," "the company's financial condition," "corporate inflexibility". Inconsistent policies or the lack of sound management decisions bother 2%. "Vacillation on the part of management," "unclear objectives," "policy rewrites five and six times," "decision making hesitancy by others".

A number of unquantifiable — and occasionally amusing — factors are also offered as unsatisfying aspects of 12% of the employment executives' jobs. Having to attend and/or organize charity drives and bowling leagues is annoying to many, and morale booster activities, such as picnics, apparently have had some adverse effects on certain employment executives' own morale. Others find their own time usurped to too great an extent by travel. One comment, in a way, tells the total story: "I am the complaint department".

From this potpourri of gripes some sex patterns emerge: female employment executives more frequently express dislike for paperwork, and some are intimidated by recruitment and interviewing. On the other hand, male employment executives are vociferous in their dislike of complying with government regulations.

Plans to Remain in the Employment Field

Given a choice, will these employment executives stay in the field? Sixty-seven percent say they will, but 12% indicate they would prefer other types of work, mainly administrative and managerial. Twenty-one percent are undecided or did not answer.

TABLE XXIII

INTENT TO REMAIN IN EMPLOYMENT FIELD: BY SEX, AGE, YEARS IN THE FIELD AND EMPLOYMENT RESPONSIBILITY

		Sex		Age Group				Years in Employment Field						No. of Employees in Range of Responsibility					
	Total	Male	Female	Under 35	35-44	45-54	55 or Over	Under 6	6-10	11-15	16-20	21-25	Over 25	Under 500	500-999	1,000-4,999	5,000-9,999	10,000-24,999	25,000- or Over
	(905)	(728)	(158)	(290)	(334)	(211)	(62)	(259)	(247)	(193)	(109)	(53)	(42)	(211)	(172)	(325)	(73)	(56)	(57)
	100%	80%	18%	32%	37%	23%	7%	29%	27%	21%	12%	6%	5%	23%	19%	36%	8%	6%	6%
No. of respondents in each class. = 100%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Intend to remain in employment field?																			
Yes	67	67	65	59	69	71	82	59	64	73	73	74	79	78	70	64	59	52	56
No	12	12	11	18	12	7	5	20	11	9	6	9	7	6	11	15	15	19	11
Don't know/no answer	21	21	24	23	19	22	13	21	25	18	21	17	14	16	19	21	26	29	33

Female employment executives seem a little less certain about their future intentions than the men (see Table XXIII).

The desire to stay in the field increases directly with age, as might be expected. Eighty-two percent of the 55 and over group report they will stay versus only 59% of those under the age of 35.

Interestingly, those responsible for fewer employees indicate they will stick with employment work, while those with a greater scope of responsibility are not so certain.

It appears the employment executives' intent to stay in the field increases the longer they are in it.

Career Replay

Given another chance to be back at the thresholds of their careers, would employment executives take the same road? Approximately two-thirds (66%) say they would. Fifteen percent would have opted for something else. Nineteen percent are undecided or had no answer (see Table XXIV).

Female employment executives are somewhat more enthusiastic than the males, 70% having answered positively vis-a-vis 65% of the men. This represents something of a dichotomy, given that by and large the female employment executives in the study are not as happy with some important aspects of their current positions as the men. Perhaps it is the nature of the work rather than their current employment situation that pleases them.

TABLE XXIV

CHOOSE EMPLOYMENT FIELD AGAIN?: BY SEX, AGE AND LOCATION

		Sex		Age				Geographic Location					
	Total	Male	Female	Under 35	35-44	45-54	55 or Over	New Eng.	Mid-Atl.	South-east	Mid-west	South-west	West
	(905)	(728)	(158)	(290)	(334)	(211)	(62)	(164)	(273)	(63)	(216)	(56)	(127)
	100%	80%	18%	32%	37%	23%	7%	18%	30%	7%	24%	6%	14%
No. of respondents in each class = 100%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Choose Employment Field Again?													
Yes	66	65	70	72	64	61	65	67	62	73	71	70	62
No	15	15	16	12	15	18	19	14	20	8	13	12	14
Don't know/no answer	19	20	14	16	21	21	16	19	18	19	16	18	24

The under 35 group is the most enthusiastic about the employment field. Geographically, Southeasterners registered the greatest liking for the field and Westerners and employment executives from the Mid-Atlantic region the least.

V. OPINIONS ON DEVELOPMENTS IN EMPLOYMENT FIELD

Feelings About Term "Human Resources"

The employment executives were asked their feelings about the term "human resources" — should it be substituted for "personnel," "employment," and "industrial relations" in department and personal titles?

Nearly half (47%) like that idea. Thirty-two percent do not care for the substitution, and 21% have no opinion on the matter. Male and female respondents seem to feel similarly about it, and, from the geographical viewpoint, employment executives in the Eastern part of the U.S. are somewhat more receptive to the idea than those in other areas.

Will Human Resources Provide Upward Job Mobility?

The group was asked, "Do you think the increasing (corporate) emphasis on human resources will result in moving employment people into top management positions?"

Fifty-nine percent reply yes, 29% say no, and 12% have no opinion or did not answer. Again, female employment executives tended to be a little more optimistic on this point than their male colleagues (see Table XXVI). This sanguineness declined with increasing age.

TABLE XXV

FEELINGS ABOUT "HUMAN RESOURCES" TITLE

	Geographic Location						
	Total (905) 100%	New Eng. (164) 18%	Mid-Atl. (273) 30%	South-east (63) 7%	Mid-west (216) 24%	South-west (56) 6%	West (127) 14%
No. of respondents in geographic location = 100%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Should "Human Resources" Be Used in Titles?							
Yes	47	47	50	49	46	34	44
No	32	35	32	24	30	34	35
No opinion/no answer	21	18	18	27	24	32	21

TABLE XXVI

FUTURE CHANCE OF EMPLOYMENT PEOPLE FOR TOP MANAGEMENT

		Sex		Age			
	Total	Male	Female	Under 35	35-44	45-54	55 or Over
	(905)	(728)	(158)	(290)	(334)	(211)	(62)
	100%	80%	18%	32%	37%	23%	7%
No. of respondents in sex or age group = 100%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Will Employment People Be Moving into Top Management?							
Yes	59	58	61	65	62	51	42
No	29	30	24	24	27	37	29
No answer	12	12	15	11	11	12	29

Portending Major Developments in the Field

What do employment executives expect to be the major development in their field in the next decade? As Table XXVII shows, no one response is dominant, although various corporate changes are the most widely mentioned (37%). Eight percent, for instance, think that increasing recognition/professional status will be given the employment field, and that there will be more of an emphasis on human resources. "Management is definitely giving more recognition to the personnel function," states one respondent. Another expects human resources to be included as an equal partner in the corporate business plan — along with product development. Also anticipated is "more reliance of top line management on human resources managers and other personnel," and "increased recognition of human resources as a vital part of a business".

A number of executives (7%) expect computers to be the major new factor in the 1980s. Some comments: "Computer job banks with individual access by public and private organizations using terminals located in the individual organizations," "the use of computers in the interviewing process," "greater use of computers to aid in career planning of present employees," "more use of internal (in-house) search via computers to promote/transfer people within the organization".

Changes in recruiting techniques are expected by 5%: One respondent anticipates "the recognition that there is nothing special about search firms. Most professional staffing functions will do more research and sourcing on their own. Search firms may go to hourly sourcing". Another agrees that there will be "more direct recruitment — less reliance on agencies". However, the opposite view is

held by some who comment, for example, that there will be "more reliance on executive search".

"Testing will boom again," predicts one executive, representing those who foresee "more accurate psychological evaluation and better job placement," and "better and more accurate assessment of human resources potential".

Other respondents expect less recruiting on the local level and "more national and international recruiting programs". Interestingly, one employment executive projects extensive use of employment contracts by large employers.

Four percent of the respondents expect greater specialization and more sophisticated techniques in the employment field. "The age of the personnel generalist is in question," is one view. "Due to economic considerations and legislative requirements, we will all need to be experts concentrating on a specific skill," is another response. Some project "more sophistication relative to skills inventory and career planning and development for employees at all levels".

A few (2%) mentioned their expectation of greater emphasis on productivity. One noted "the necessity to assume and/or acquire greater responsibility to establish a work situation that promotes greater productivity," and "the need for an increased ability to sense productiveness during recruitment". Others (2%) look to more effective utilization of the workforce: "better adaptation of work to the employee rather than the employee to work," as one respondent phrased it.

Greater selectivity on the part of corporations — "more stringent and increased job requirements" — is mentioned, as is increased attention to legal matters (2%) because of a greater number of lawsuits and "increased legal involvement," perhaps resulting in more attorneys in the employment field. One suggestion is that all personnel people receive some specialized training in legal affairs. "The profession will become more and more legislative and less concerned with individuals," predicts another.

Five percent point to changes in recruitment/selection techniques, and 4% think employment people will play a more important role in management, seeing "more input by employment directly through to top corporate management," "a more activist role in general management," "more 'tie-in' between business strategic planning and human resources," and "greater participation in the business decisions of the corporation".

The size and composition of the workforce are in for some changes as well, according to 19% of the group. There will be a shortage of top executives and technical talent. At the same time, however, more women, minority members and handicapped persons will be working, according to 4% of the responding executives; 2% expect new employment patterns for the aged, mothers, and part-timers, citing "hiring of more middle aged people into management jobs — and more retirements at a younger age," "establishing nursery facilities on plant sites for working mothers," "utilization of the 65+ age group, plus more use of part-time employees".

Seventeen percent foresee improvements for employees. Among this group, 12% think the major development in the employment field in the next decade will involve employment training programs and career development. Typical comments:

". . .the employment field will become more people-oriented — more emphasis on in-house training, full utilization of the current workforce through sophisticated means of identifying promotable employees."

". . .increased use of internal employee skills data base and an increase in formal training and career development."

". . .extensive internal retraining of those with obsolete skills."

". . .establishment of more sophisticated management training programs for college grads — recognition that a trained workforce is not available for employment."

". . .provision of more training of existing employees at all levels."

Some respondents (5%) believe the major new development will be increased salaries and benefits. Several specifically expect the increased implementation of "cafeteria benefits", or, as one executive phrases it, "large enticements in terms of exotic group benefit fringes and flexible compensation plans". This is also phrased as "the packaging of benefits to the individual's needs," "increased emphasis on benefits — e.g., more choices as alternatives to salary increases". In contrast, though, another respondent expects "more emphasis on cash compensation and less on deferred or indirect compensation".

Government intervention and increased regulation are seen by 16% as a major — and negative — development in the employment field in the next decade. Almost all the comments on this have a pejorative ring: "The continued encroachment of government on the selection decision will reduce the decision making responsibilities of the function," "having very little to say about who you can hire," "increased paperwork required by federal, state and local laws," "less and less freedom to employ people of our own choosing — the government within about ten years will be dictating who you can hire, fire, promote, etc.," "total government direction".

More local employment and diminished mobility because of the "spouse's career consideration," and the cost of living emerge as changes to come in the 1980s, in the view of a few of the respondents. Conversely, another small group sees a more mobile workforce because of ERISA with its protection of pensions from job to job. Two aspects of turnover also received a handful of comments: one typical respondent sees "more outplacement — more turnover at management levels," while another predicts "an earnest effort by employers to retain valued employees rather than allow them to leave without an honest effort to turn them around to stay".

Emphasis on affirmative action is expected to decrease by 1% of the respondents; others see changes in emphasis. For example, one respondent anticipates "a maturity in the EEO, bringing about a more relaxed environment with better relations among employer-employee-government". Another executive expects the same bottom line, but brought about by "more reverse discrimination charges by white males". Others hope for "less and less emphasis on sex and race and more of a return to the most qualified employment".

Changes and/or shortages in the workforce size and composition will be the major development of the next decade, 19% believe. Some (7%) foresee shortages of the technically skilled, machine-oriented white collar worker, e.g., secretaries, typists, programmers, word processors. Others predict extreme shortages of middle and upper level management and of mature senior executives. A number not only forecast a "scarcity of engineers and computer science types," but "intense competition for 'specialists' as opposed to generalists in engineering, scientific and information science fields".

Stiffer competition for outstanding people coupled with "greater acceptance of lesser skilled individuals and more internal promotion with training due to lack of qualified employees" may also be in the cards for the 1980s, according to survey participants.

Expectations for the next decade that fall into the "miscellaneous" category include:

". . . greater evolution of outplacement"
". . . learning institutions being more sensitive to needs of industry, especially technical"
". . . reacting to an older workforce"
". . . acceptance of the concept of the right to a job"
". . . the change in technology necessitating the retraining of a tremendous group of employees"
". . . the change in the relationship between labor and management — from superior/subordinate to equal exchange"

TABLE XXVII

MAJOR DEVELOPMENT IN THE EMPLOYMENT FIELD IN THE 1980s

Major Development	% of Respondents
Corporate:	37
Increased recognition/professional status of employment function	8
Greater use of computers/DP	7
Change in recruiting/selection techniques	5
More participation in management by employment people	4
More specialization/sophistication in employment techniques	4
More emphasis on, better productivity	2
Better/proper utilization of workforce	2
Increased attention to legal matters	2
More selectivity/tougher qualifications	1
Increased/decreased turnover	1
Decreased emphasis on affirmative action	1
Workforce size/composition:	19
Shortage of top talent/technical talent	7
More demand/competition for graduates highly technical personnel	5
Increasing numbers of women/minorities in job market	4
New employment patterns for aged/working mothers/part-timers	2
Fewer jobs, reduced workforce	*
Improvements for employees:	17
More emphasis on training programs/ career development/internal human resources development	12
Increased compensation/better benefits	5
Shorter work week/4-day week	*
Government: increased/continued intervention/regulation	16
Other	17
Don't know/no answer	18
	**

*Less than 1%
**Total exceeds 100%, due to multiple response.

VI. PRODUCTIVITY

Why the Decline?

"Productivity rate causes worry," read a recent New York Times headline over an article describing how economists, businessmen, and government officials have become concerned about a marked drop in the nation's productivity growth rate, a development they fear will reduce economic growth and increase inflation and unemployment. "Short of war, the 'productivity gap' is the greatest threat ever to confront the U.S.," claims the chairman of a major firm. "If management doesn't come to grips with productivity — and it is a management problem — we're in for trouble. No one can afford to settle for higher wages and plan to pass through the cost; neither can we deprive workers of justifiable increases".

Few employment executives would disagree that productivity is at least partly a management problem. Many others, however, perceive the diminution in productivity as being much more fragmented in its causes (see Table XXIX) and extraordinarily far-reaching in its adverse effects. And, as that part of management which deals with the companies' human resources — in the seeking, hiring, motivating, counselling, and possible terminating of members of the workforce — employment people are in a position to comment knowledgeably on cause and effect.

The employment executives sampled in this survey offered an abundance of comments on the productivity problem:

Social Change vs. Productivity

Asked why they think there has been such a decline in productivity, 41% say this is a social problem, stemming from changing social and work attitudes. Among such attitudes cited are the recent emphasis on self awareness, on individuality, "the increasing philosophy of be yourself, 'do your own thing', fight or challenge the establishment". This was also described as a "gimme-gimme philosophy" and "the 'what's in it for me', 'me first' attitude". Others pointed to "changing social values," "more emphasis on leisure time activities and family," "the ethic of non-responsibility bred directly from the 'good life' achievement," "individuals wanting more from life than hard work".

The lack of incentives to work is cited by 11% of respondents: "People are getting lazy." Others attributed the decline in motivation to the average worker's inability to grasp the "cause and effect" relationship between his or her efforts and the bottom line.

The declining work ethic was also blamed by 10% for the poor performance of today's worker. "The work ethic is no longer taught in homes, school, churches," one executive comments. According to another, "The work ethic is being diluted by permissiveness throughout the impressionable years". A third states, "Post World War II children are today's workforce. Their work ethic has diminished. People are concentrating more on social and family lives".

Has the old spirit of pride in work and company loyalty fled? Seven percent of these employment executives think so. "There's a lack of pride in workmanship," observed one respondent, ". . . an inability to relate individual input to the finished product". Others think loyalty to one's company is a thing of the past as well. They deplore the lack of employee involvement in and commitment to the company, which is, they felt, at least partly the fault of management. "Employees do not feel they are part of the company," runs a typical comment. "Layers of bureaucracy stifle commitment, communication, and understanding." "The lack of interest and understanding by employees of overall company objectives" is also seen as a contributory factor.

Unions as a Cause

The influence of unions, mentioned by 21%, provoked much comment, almost universally negative. "Unions strive for mediocrity among all workers," claims one respondent. Another blames the "let George do it" syndrome fostered by unions, and their "no increase in productivity" contracts. Others complain of the "what's in it for me" and "that's not my job" attitudes promoted by large unions.

Is Management Itself the Problem?

Poor management was called a cause of the productivity decline by 11% of the employment executives. Management's lack of imagination and innovation, its "failure to insist on maintaining standards of excellence and responsibility" are blamed, as are "company acceptance of lackadaisical work habits" and "allowing employees to get by doing as little as possible". Others feel the management

problem is "lack of proper managerial skills necessary to keep employees motivated" and "the backing away of management from its responsibility to educate the public, the government, unions and employees to the needs of the business and high standards of performance". Some cite "supervisors' inability to manage their human resources," "businesses' inability to adjust to the complexity of the workforce as rapidly as it is changing," and "industry's inability to accurately assess and plan to use human resources according to organizational needs".

A lack of employee recognition and the absence of merit compensation systems sometimes cause workers to shift into low gear, according to 4% of respondents, who pointed to the lack of rewards to those who are most productive. "The mediocre do as well," asserts one executive. "There's utter disregard for the employee's need to achieve and be recognized for it," says another. One executive blames the loss of the "American dream" to the standardization of rewards: raises, promotions, and benefits are given in categories because the group achieved, not because the individual did.

The lack of diversity in duties and the sense of meaninglessness caused by mundane, routine tasks are seen as the basis for productivity problems by 3% of the sample. Some major contributors to worker apathy: "repetition and boredom. . .too many people are underemployed," "uninteresting jobs (or rather business' lack of effort to make them more interesting)".

Government as a Contributing Factor

Fourteen percent of the respondents feel the villain of the productivity piece is the morass of government intervention and regulation. "There's too much

government intervention and protectionism. Anyone can survive without working," claims one. "Workers' awareness that their 'security' is protected by the government leads to lower productivity." "Federal programs are actively undermining the American work ethic," comments another executive. "Some of the regulations hamper the ability to weed out employees who are not doing the job." One interesting observation is "I feel the increased legislation regulating the ability to choose more discriminantly (not discriminately) their employees has forced companies to hire 'sub-motivated' employees. Thus, low quality!"

Others (5%) are angry at the welfare system. "Government subsidized programs cause the employee to have a cushion to fall back on," holds one. Another cites "the notion that even with no job, basic human needs will be met by society picking up the tab".

High taxes comes in for some hammerblows, as does the current economic situation: "There's less motivation to work on the part of younger workers at all levels — possibly a result of feeling hopeless in the face of inflation's pressures."

Education and the Home

The American educational system is considered culpable, as well. Comments one respondent, "Colleges and universities are major contributors to the dissent. They do not promote the work ethic. Also, the value systems they teach reinforce unionism". Another observed, "Inadequate public school systems make very few 'graduates' qualified to advance in any job. Declining standards in the educational system have contributed to the lack of pride, loyalty, and motivation".

TABLE XXVIII

MAJOR CAUSE OF PRESENT DECLINE IN PRODUCTIVITY

Major Cause	% of Respondents
Employees:	41
Employee attitudes/changing values/ younger generation	11
Lack of incentive/motivation/worker apathy	11
Lack of work ethic	10
Lack of pride in work	5
Lack of employee loyalty	2
Lack of employee commitment/involvement	2
Lack of good employees	*
Unions:	21
Corporations:	21
Poor management/supervision	11
Lack of employee recognition/merit compensation system	4
Boring jobs/job dissatisfaction	3
Lack of/improper capital investment	2
Poor use of workforce/job structuring	1
Government:	20
Intervention/regulations	14
Welfare system	5
Taxation	1
State of the economy	4
Poor education	3
Poor parental guidance	*
Other	13
Don't know/no answer	13
	**

*Less than 1%.
**Total exceeds 100%, due to multiple response.

Lastly, everyone's favorite scapegoat comes in for a few knocks, too. "It's parents' fault," claim several executives. "Permissiveness in schools/homes in early years results in a lack of individual responsibility." Another says the productivity gap is traceable to "poor fundamentals taught by parents and schools about the salutary effects of the work ethic".

How to Reverse It

What can be done to turn the tide on productivity? Many of the antidotes suggested by employment people, not unexpectedly, relate to their own area of specialization. Ten percent of the respondents recommend the establishment of incentive reward systems and the distribution of bonuses (see Table XXIX):

". . . restore more incentive pay systems; revise the seniority systems that foster non-performance"
". . . pay should equal productivity. Take away from non-producers"
". . . reward only the worthy"
". . . keep working to assure that the reward structure is directly tied to productivity"
". . . make a significant portion of compensation productivity-dependent"

Seven percent of the respondents think the approach should be to improve management supervision. "Staff management positions with people who approach the work arena diagnostically," suggests one executive. "Choose supervisors/managers who can effect participative management and develop employee goals to coordinate with company goals," counsels another. Another believes, "When supervisors are promoted from the ranks they should undergo thorough training in human relations and motivation.

Another feels the answer was "better preparation for persons entering into management and more exposure to problem solving for present managers".

More effective employee relations and communications are recommended by 7% to help improve the productivity rate: "Recognize the new breed of worker and develop more appropriate environment and jobs to meet their demands/situation," suggests one respondent. "Have business take a more active role in changing its image. . . stress 'people concern' ". Another believes companies should "develop ongoing and continuing management-employee contact". A good approach would be to "address workers individually. . . give more positive feedback," thinks another.

Stressing the worth of the individual worker is seen as a solution by 5%: "Change workers' perception that management doesn't care about them by creating a greater management sensitivity, thus discouraging the need for unions," "emphasize 'people worth' in productivity," "endeavor to treat all employees as important human beings and individuals in their work environment and make them aware that their contribution has an important effect on the success of the company".

Making employees feel involved and giving them a sense of participation may foster more pride in work, say 5%. "Give them more say-so in what they do, how they do it, and what the result should be," "recognize employees' values and integrate with company goals to improve productivity," and "increase morale and pride in work along with more employee involvement," are some suggestions.

The related idea that giving employees a greater role in decision making and more responsibility would increase production is suggested by 4%. Some recommendations: "Return to the individual responsibility for himself," offers one. "Treat people as adults and give them more control over <u>how</u> work is to be done — for starters," "push decision making tools down to the lowest possible level," "make people responsible for their actions (accountability)."

Job enrichment and automating boring jobs are also mentioned by 4% as ways of combatting the productivity crisis. Others suggest that in-depth studies be made on what actually motivates people.

Others (2%) urge setting higher standards but at the same time exhibiting better examples. "Raise expectations," exhorts one executive.

Two percent think improvement of the selection process would help: "Sourcing people with skills directly related to their positions."

Most of those who cite the work ethic agreed that a return to this concept has to begin at home. "Make it more difficult to live without working," suggested one respondent. "Rekindle the value of work in grade school and junior high school." Another recommends "radical changes in early education through the college level to reemphasize the value of quality in work performance at all levels of employment".

A few think better use of capital would reverse the decline — "Allocate more money, research, manpower, and planning to programming a productivity incline." According to another, the situation might be improved by the increased use of stock options/employee ownership plans that would give employees a sense of belonging.

Eighteen percent of the respondents think the government can aid in the fight to reverse productivity: it should decrease its intervention and regulations, reduce welfare and artificial income support systems, fight inflation, stop spending, and reform taxes, according to the survey sample. Some typical comments:

". . . revise the nation's thinking to effect social reform. Make it more attractive to work than to be on welfare, to be a self-respecting, tax-paying citizen rather than a rip-off artist."
". . . drop socialistic trends, i.e., unemployment, welfare, food stamps, etc."
". . . continue the efforts to demonstrate to government that business can solve its own problems voluntarily"
". . . shift power back toward the management side and away from unions and government"
". . . permit business a freer hand in controlling personnel, but on a fair basis"
" . . . eliminate the minimum wage; get rid of deficit spending; sharply limit welfare payments."

Eight percent of the respondents think education at all levels and ages should be revamped to promote greater productivity: "Prepare youngsters for work," suggests one. "There should be a different type of training in the schools," another thought, "with an emphasis on ethics". "Terminate teachers who do not or cannot perform — do not permit children to advance from a grade unless qualified," demands another. Others recommended, "Teach the economic principle that there's no such thing as a free lunch," and "promote better industry-education relationships through cooperative education programs".

Seven percent think the power of unions should be reduced to increase productivity. "Eliminate all union security agreements. Return to tough work standards," says one executive, who adds, "Eliminate any clauses calling for minimum amounts of workers in union contract." Another thinks companies should work to "eliminate unions as a representative of the average worker — unions have become big business themselves".

Four percent think productivity can be improved by some sort of political change: "Continue to defeat labor reform bills in Congress and have management "tighten the screws," one believes to be the answer. "Elect politicians with different attitudes and communicate more effectively to the public the value of

our ideas — democratic, competitive systems." Another wants everyone to "lobby and vote to assure that those elected believe that the role of government should be restricted to provision of essential services only".

A few (2%) want to return to a freer, more competitive market: "Free the free enterprise," is one counsel. "Return to truer principles of our capitalistic society."

Less than 1% think the decline will correct itself, or that it doesn't need correcting. "Nothing can be done except to let it run its course — the pendulum of history never stops swinging," observes one executive.

TABLE XXIX

METHODS FOR REVERSING PRODUCTIVITY DECLINE

Method	% of Respondents
Corporations:	48
Establish incentive reward system/merit bonuses	10
Improve management/supervision	7
Better employee relations/communications	7
Employee participation program/ programs to increase worker pride	5
Greater role in decisions/more responsibility for employees	4
Job enrichment/change/automate boring jobs	4
Increase employee motivation	3
Set higher quality work standard	2
Improve selection/human resource programs	2
Re-establish the work ethic	2
Increases/changes in capital investment	1
Profit sharing/stock options	1
Government:	18
Decrease intervention/regulations	8
Reduce welfare/artificial income support systems	5
Control govt. spending to control inflation/fight inflation	3
Tax reform	2
Education: better/increased; vocational	8
Unions: Reduce power/spread right to work	7
New political leaders/greater individual/company political activity	4
Return to free market economy/ more competition	2
Nothing/will correct itself/ doesn't need to be changed	*
Other	11
Don't know/no answer	26
	**

*Less than 1%
**Total exceeds 100%, due to multiple response.

VII. SOME CONCLUSIONS

General

As was the case 20 years ago, titles in this field continue to be highly varied, with very little visible in the way of standardization. This is also the case with people to whom employment executives report.

Employment people are a well-educated group, most having had experience in other areas of work before becoming involved in human resources. Like their contemporaries in other fields, most use computers in their work and 90% of those who do expect this usage to increase in the coming years.

Human resources planning continues to be heavily oriented to the short term, with nearly half of the participants reporting that needs in their organizations are projected only a year in advance.

A majority of the respondents see prospects for employment people to move into top management due to the increasing emphasis on human resources.

It is interesting that such a broad range of responses was offered to the survey's open-end questions relating to upcoming major developments in the field and the problems of productivity. While many new developments were postulated, no single area was mentioned by a majority of the respondents. Similarly, the

productivity problem was attributed to multiple causes and no single answer was agreed upon by a majority of the responding employment people.

If there is a common denominator among employment executives, it might be said to be a distaste for the heavy loads of paperwork with which they must deal.

Overall, the group appears to be satisfied with the work they do and most intend to stay in the employment field. Some differences do appear, however, in terms of the respondents' sex and age.

By Sex

For one thing, the sexes appear to enter the field by different routes: men via outside sources such as employment agencies and search firms more often than women, who worked their way up within the organizations. Survey data also suggested there is a growing number of women in the field, many of them representing a new generation of employment people, since 41% of these women report that their current job is their first in this field.

It appears from the survey that women derive more satisfaction from the personal interaction their work provides, while men are more interested in its planning and development aspects. Women are more apt to list paperwork as a dissatisfying aspect of their work while men cite government regulations. While the female employment people who responded seem less content with their work than the men, are less satisfied with rate of promotion, and tend to feel they are of more value than their salaries would indicate, they are more positive about their careers (in answer to the "replay" question) and toward prospects for human resources jobs leading to top management.

Not surprisingly, the male respondents are better educated and in positions of higher responsibility. They are also more involved in planning and initiating human resources policies (though more than half the women do make plans and policies). Men apparently are more likely to work with computers on the job, have more access to top management, and be more content with recognition in their organizations.

By Age

Two-thirds of the participants in this study are under 45, and this segment tends to be somewhat more educated than the older groups. It is the under 35 group which is more enthusiastic about the employment field, more optimistic about it as a road upward to the top.

The over 35 group, however, reports itself more satisfied with work and, incidentally, is more likely to be involved in the use of computers as part of the work.

Employment responsibility appears to peak in the 45-54 year old group, salary levels seem to be in direct proportion to the age of the respondents and, as might be expected, the desire to stay in the employment field increases in direct proportion to the respondents' ages.

Appendix

DS&E/EMA EMPLOYMENT EXECUTIVE PROFILE STUDY

1. What is your title?

6-1 ( ) Personnel Mgr./Dir.
-2 ( ) Employment Mgr./Dir.
-3 ( ) Recruitment Mgr./Dir.
-4 ( ) Human Resources Mgr./Dir.
-5 ( ) Mgr./Dir./Supvr.-Employee Relations
-6 ( ) Other _____ 7-
8-

2. To whom do you report? Please give title(s). _____ 9-

3. How many years have you been in the employment field?

10- ( ) under 6
( ) 6-10
( ) 11-15
( ) 16-20
( ) 21-25
( ) over 25

4. For how many other employers have you worked in the employment field?

11- ( ) none
( ) 1
( ) 2
( ) 3
( ) 4
( ) 5
( ) 6 or more

5. Have you also worked in other functions? 12-1 ( ) yes -2 ( ) no

If yes, which one(s)?

13-1 ( ) sales/marketing
-2 ( ) research/development
-3 ( ) production
-4 ( ) finance/accounting
-5 ( ) administration/management
-6 ( ) design/engineering
-7 ( ) other _____ 14-

6. How did you obtain your present position?

15-1 ( ) applied directly
-2 ( ) answered ad
-3 ( ) employment agency/ search firm
-4 ( ) promotion/transfer
-5 ( ) recruited from college
-6 ( ) employee referral
-7 ( ) referral by bus. associate
-8 ( ) other _____ 16-

7. How satisfied are you with your present position in terms of compensation, rat of promotion, access to top management, recognition within the company?

	Satisfied		Dissatisfied	
	Highly	Moderately	Somewhat	Very
Compensation.....	17-1 ( )	-2 ( )	-3 ( )	-4 ( )
Rate of promotion.....	18-1 ( )	-2 ( )	-3 ( )	-4 ( )
Access to top management.....	19-1 ( )	-2 ( )	-3 ( )	-4 ( )
Recognition within company.....	20-1 ( )	-2 ( )	-3 ( )	-4 ( )

8. What aspect of your work do you find:

Most satisfying? _____ 21-22-

Least satisfying? _____ 23-24-

BEST AVAI

9. Do you use computers in your work? 25-1( ) yes -2( ) no

If yes --
a) how extensive is your use of them?

26-1( ) very extensive use -2( ) considerable use -3( ) limited use

b) for what purposes?
27-1( ) skills register -4( ) compensation
-2( ) personnel research -5( ) other _____ 28-
-3( ) affirmative action data

c) do you expect your use of computers to increase in the future?
29-1( ) yes -2( ) no -3( ) don't know

10. Do you initiate your organization's employment policies?
30-1( ) yes -2( ) no

11. How far ahead does your organization project its human resources requirements?
31-( ) one year or less ( ) 6-10 years
( ) 2-3 years ( ) over 10 years
( ) 4-5 years ( ) don't know

12. Are you involved in this planning? 32-1( ) yes -2( ) no

13. Do you think your present compensation accurately reflects your value to the company?
33-1( ) yes -2( ) no -3( ) don't know

14. Do you plan to remain in the employment field?
34-1( ) yes -2( ) no -3( ) don't know

If no, into what function would you like to move?
35-1( ) sales/marketing -5( ) administration/management
-2( ) research/development -6( ) design/engineering
-3( ) production -7( ) other _____ 36-
-4( ) finance/accounting

15. If you could start your career over again, would you still choose the employment field?
37-1( ) yes -2( ) no -3( ) don't know

16. Do you feel the term "human resources" should be substituted for "personnel" "employment" and "industrial relations" in department and personal titles?
38-1( ) yes -2( ) no -3( ) no opinion

17. What do you foresee as the major development in the employment field in the 1980's? _____ 39-

_____ 40-

18. Do you think the increasing (corporate) emphasis on human resources will result in moving employment people into top management positions?
41-1( ) yes -2( ) no -3( ) no opinion

ABLE COPY

19. In your opinion, what is the major cause of the present decline in productivity in American industry? _____ 42

_____ 43

What would you do to reverse this decline? _____ 44

_____ 45

20. Your sex: 46-1( ) male -2( ) female

21. Your age group:
47- ( ) under 25 ( ) 45-54
( ) 25-34 ( ) 55 or over
( ) 35-44

22. Your education: Please check the highest grade you completed.

High school graduate: 48-1( )

College:
49- ( ) 1 year ( ) 2 years ( ) 3 years ( ) 4 years

Graduate school:
50- ( ) 1 year ( ) 2 years ( ) 3 years ( ) 4 years

23. If applicable, please check all your academic degrees, and write in your major field(s) of study.

51-1( ) AA, with major in: _____ 52- 53-
-2( ) BA/BS, with major in: _____ 54- 55-
-3( ) MA/MS, with major in: _____ 56- 57-
-4( ) PhD, with major in: _____ 58- 59-

24. In what section of the country do you work?
60-1( ) New England -5( ) Southwest
-2( ) mid-Atlantic -6( ) Mountain
-3( ) Southeast -7( ) West
-4( ) Midwest

25. For what type of organization do you work?
61-1( ) business/financial -4( ) government
-2( ) industrial/manufacturing -5( ) other_____ 62-
-3( ) institutional

26. For how many employees have you employment responsibility?
63-1( ) under 500 -4( ) 5,000-9,999
-2( ) 500-999 -5( ) 10,000-24,999
-3( ) 1,000-4,999 -6( ) 25,000 or over

27. What is your present base salary?
64-1( ) under $15,000 -5( ) $30-34,999
-2( ) $15-19,999 -6( ) $35-44,999
-3( ) $20-24,999 -7( ) $45,000 or over
-4( ) $25-29,999

Please return your completed questionnaire to:

DEUTSCH, SHEA & EVANS, INC.
49 East 53rd Street
New York, NY 10022

About Deutsch, Shea & Evans . . .

DS&E fills a unique niche in business ecology.

It is a consulting organization, working with many Fortune 500 companies on such problems as meeting affirmative action goals, the human aspects of relocating or expanding facilities, and meeting all types of employment needs.

It is a communications specialist, developing external and internal communications relating to human resources problems, from reassuring communities during corporate moves or labor troubles to creating campus recruitment brochures.

DS&E has established a Management Consulting Group for human resources communications to provide additional, in-depth capability in this field. Group members include well-known academicians, management experts and legal specialists.

And DS&E is an advertising agency; the only member of the American Association of Advertising Agencies which specializes exclusively in preparing and placing highly specialized recruitment advertising directed to audiences ranging from high level executives to entry-level trainees.

DS&E has contributed extensively to the literature on human resources, through its own research and writings, and as a quoted source in the business and technical press and in scholarly papers. Recently, McGraw-Hill published *The Human Resources Revolution: Communicate or Litigate*, by Arnold R. Deutsch, Chairman of DS&E.

It also conducts research with organizations such as the Employment Management Association and the International Word Processing Association to develop new data and insights on human resources and motivations.

The DS&E Recruitment Manual provides an annual compendium of useful information for employment executives. A syndicated column by DS&E, "The Employment World", has recently begun to appear in major newspapers. And DS&E sponsors the Employment Management Association/Deutsch, Shea & Evans Awards given each year to individuals who make outstanding contributions to the fields of employment and human resources.